REMARKS

The Examiner's Office Action dated on May 25, 2006 has been carefully considered. Applicant acknowledges with appreciation the Examiner's indication in the Office Action that claims 4-6 are allowed, and claims 7-10 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph. In response, Application has amended claim 7 to address and overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. It is therefore respectfully submitted that claim 7 is in condition for allowance. Dependent claims 8-10 are allowable for at least the same reason.

In this Amendment, claims 1 and 7 are independent claims. Claims 1 and 7 are amended. Claims 1-10 are now pending in the application. For at least the following reasons, it is submitted that this application is in condition for allowance.

Claims 1-3, and 7-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Claims 1 and 7 are amended, and therefore the rejection is respectfully traversed.

On a substantive basis, claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Applicant's admission of prior art (AAPA) and Drerup (U.S. Patent No. 5,333,285). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicant's independent claim 1 defines a booting method capable of executing a warm boot or a cold boot in a computer system when a CPU (Central Processing Unit) crash occurs, the computer system having a CPU and a memory, the CPU controlling the memory, the memory storing data and predefined values of the computer system. The claimed comprises the steps of: (a) causing the computer system to detect whether a hardware reset function or a software reset function is selected when the CPU is in a crash state; (b) when the hardware reset function is

selected, rebooting the CPU by executing a hardware reset operation, and deleting the data and predefined values of the memory to make the computer system return to a default; and (c) when the software reset function is selected, rebooting the CPU by executing a hardware reset operation, and regarding the hardware reset operation as a software reset operation to holds the data and predefined values of memory to make the computer system return to a setting state before the CPU crash.

In contrast, Drerup discloses "Since, the system timer is the highest priority interrupt to the local CPU on the feature card, it is assumed that the system may have crashed if the system timer goes unserviced. Normally, when the watchdog timer expires an interrupt is output to drive a non-maskable interrupt (NMI) reset service routine on the local (feature card) CPU. This NMI routine can check the keyboard for a CTRL-ALT-DEL sequence. If the CTRL-ALT-DEL is not detected it is assumed that the NMI routine was falsely invoked (since a user will normally input the CTRL-ALT-Delete sequence if a system crash has actually occurred) and the watchdog timer is reset and the NMI routine ends. If CTRL-ALT-DEL is detected then a soft reset is initiated by invoking the system initialization routine, such as the power on self test (POST)." (See col. 2, lines 13-28)(*Emphasis added*)

In rejecting claim 1, the Office Action points to the disclosure of Drerup as teaching that the system can execute the software reset function when CPU is in a crash state. In fact, Drerup only discloses "If CTRL-ALT-DEL is detected then a soft reset is initiated." Accordingly, there is no disclosure or suggestion by Drerup or AAPA of "(a) causing the computer system to detect whether a hardware reset function or a software reset function is selected when the CPU is in a crash state", and "(c) when the software reset function is selected, rebooting the CPU by executing a hardware reset operation, and regarding the hardware reset operation as a software

reset operation to hold the data and predefined values of memory to make the computer system return to a setting state before the CPU crash", as claim 1 requires (*emphasis added*). For at least this reason, the combination of AAPA and Drerup does not disclose or even suggest the all of the features, recited in claim 1.

As such, the claimed method is not disclosed nor is it suggested by AAPA and Drerup. Therefore, claim 1 is not rendered obvious by the cited reference. Moreover, since claims 2-6 depend from claim 1, claims 2-6 also are not rendered obvious by AAPA and Drerup. Accordingly, the rejection of claims 1-6 should be withdrawn.

Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Notice of such allowance and passing of the application to issue, are earnestly requested. Should the Examiner feel that a conference would be helpful in expediting the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is hereby invited to contact the undersigned counsel to arrange for such an interview.

No fee is believed to be due in connection with this amendment and response to Office Action. If, however, any fee is believed to be due, you are hereby authorized to charge any such fee to deposit account No. 20-0778.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

Daniel R. McClure
Registration No. 38,962

Thomas, Kayden, Horstemeyer & Risley, LLP
100 Galleria Pkwy, NW
Suite 1750
Atlanta, GA 30339
770-933-9500